

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 15, 1902.

Number 206.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

Once more Lord Kitchener "regrets to report"—this time "greatly." And well may he "greatly regret," for the capture of Gen. Methuen appears under the circumstances, and as in its psychological effects it will doubtless prove to be, the worst disaster the British have yet suffered in this stupendous conflict.

It was the British defeat at Saratoga that turned the tide of the American Revolution. Although that war dragged on many years after this decisive event, its culmination in the independence of the United States was thenceforth inevitable; for the Saratoga victory revived the spirits of the Americans, it dampened the ardor of England, and it made possible the intervention of France. Similar results may reasonably be looked for from the capture of Methuen. Important as this capture is, merely as a battle victory, it is infinitely more important for the message it conveys to the desperately struggling Boer people, to the stolid masses of Great Britain, and to the onlooking world.

Lord Kitchener has for weeks been laying enormous but futile traps for the capture of Gen. DeWet, and the tory government has assured the British people that with DeWet out of the field the Boer resistance would collapse. But Gen. Delarey discredits these assurances and throws suspicion upon Kitchener's competency by achieving a victory which admonishes everybody that even if DeWet were captured the end of the war would not be in sight, for Delarey would still be at large. Nor is that all. The fact

is emphasized that besides Delarey and DeWet there is Botha, who has recently given a good account of himself; and the ignorant and confiding are excited to wonder what other talent for defensive warfare, as yet without distinction, these patriotic leaders may not have in their following and under their tuition?

So shocking to the assumed confidence of the British government is this spectacular victory of Delarey's, so significant is it of the unexhausted possibilities of the Boer powers of resistance, that the necessity is freely considered in official circles in London for adding 30,000 more troops to the 300,000 that have already been sent into South Africa. But it is only a few days since a British minister stated on the floor of the House of Commons that a call for more troops would probably mean conscription. So far the supply of troops has been drawn largely from the "submerged tenth." Men coming from that quarter, however, have proved to be defective. Even if they were efficient, the supply of those to whom love of adventure and "a sure living so long as they don't get shot" are important considerations, has given out. A continuance of the war with a larger force, therefore, will mean to England something more than empty boasts about British valor. It will mean that the flower of the British people must either enlist or stand a draft. This would put the British to a test which defensive patriotism might well endure, but from which the spirit of foreign conquest is almost certain to recoil. It was that possibility, and not personal sympathy for Methuen, who has suffered only one of the ordinary fortunes of war, that depressed the jingo element of Great Britain when the news came, and, save for

Irish cheers, cast the House of Commons in gloom.

Nor is the effect of Delarey's exploit likely to begin and end with the dampening of British ardor. Other nations will feel its influence. Even our own pro-British government may realize that a change is taking place which demands that Boer envoys be treated by it with international respect, and that our nominal neutrality be made more genuine. Should the South African republics succeed in preserving their independence the history of the British supply post at New Orleans—where British army agents rendezvous horses and mules and ship them directly in British army transports to the British forces in South Africa—might unpleasantly disturb our future diplomatic negotiations with the triumphant Boers; and, conscious of this, our government might abolish the American base of British war supplies. If Delarey's achievement secured no more than the stoppage of this manifest breach of neutrality, it would have virtually won the war for his people.

One fact in connection with Delarey's capture of Methuen is worthy of special comment. When Lord Roberts announced the disaster on the floor of the House of Lords, he assured the British public that Delarey's conduct throughout the war was a guarantee that Gen. Methuen would be well cared for. This is more than an ordinary tribute. For it must be borne in mind that British officers have shot and hanged Boer prisoners without mercy, and that the British government has approved it. Scores of Boer soldiers, captured by the British, have been hanged as traitors. They were not deserters from the British army, but were only claimed as British subjects by birth,

residents of Cape Colony who had joined the armies of the Boer republics. The universally conceded right of voluntary expatriation was denied them; and in their case the old British doctrine of "once a British subject always a British subject," one of the causes of our war with Great Britain in 1812, was revived to make an excuse for hanging them. To hang these men for joining the Boers was the same as if in our civil war we had hanged Northern men found fighting for the Confederacy, or the Confederacy had hanged East Tennesseans who served in the Federal army. Besides hanging scores of such men the British have gone the length of shooting Boer commandants whom they had captured. One was Scheepers, whose alleged crime was violation of the laws of war. He denied the charges circumstantially, but a British army court-martial convicted him. British newspapers of high standing have shown that even if the facts laid to his charge were true, all that he did was done under orders from military superiors, and that this should have exonerated him from responsibility. It was evident, however, that he was doomed from the hour of his capture. Another commandant, Kritzinger, is under trial by British court-martial upon similar charges. Apparently the British army policy in South Africa is to shoot prisoners whose military exploits have embarrassed them, using baseless charges of military crime as their legal excuse, and the assumption that the Boer government is only a government on horseback as their moral justification; and Gen. Delarey, were he to retaliate, now that he has Methuen in custody, would be justified. But, notwithstanding these British outrages upon prisoners; notwithstanding the widespread desolation of his country by the wanton burnings of Boer farms, whole districts at a time, by British orders; notwithstanding the horrors and wholesale deaths of the reconcentration camps which the British army has established in South Africa in imitation of Weyler in Cuba—notwithstanding all this provocation, Gen.

Delarey's character for humanity has been so deeply impressed upon his enemy that Lord Roberts feels justified in publicly guaranteeing the safety of Methuen in Delarey's hands. One could hardly feel so sure of Delarey's safety in Kitchener's hands.

It would be difficult to characterize the spirit in which the American invasion of the Philippines was begun and is maintained, so accurately yet with such bitter though unconscious irony, as it was done the other night by Funston—he who secured a brigadier general's commission and a rather discreditable niche in American military history, by the spy methods he adopted to capture Aguinaldo. This sudden and somewhat unsavory brigadier general was being dined and wined at a Chicago Republican club, where he made a speech imperiously denouncing Americans who stand for the Declaration of Independence. Ignoring the really vital fact that no American soldiers would have been hurt in the Philippines if they had not defied the traditions of their own country by invading the islands, he absurdly and with apparent malice tried to shift responsibility for the slaughter since January, 1900, to the anti-imperialists. But the gem of his speech was the sentence already alluded to as unconsciously satirizing the spirit of the invasion. Said he:

Let us keep our differences to ourselves until the sovereignty of the United States has been established. Then, if we must, let us pull hair among ourselves as to how we shall dispose of our possessions.

There is the idea exactly. Let us keep quiet until the theft is complete, and then quarrel all we please over the division of the loot! And that is modern patriotism! Where do its ethics and tactics differ, except in magnitude, from those of a midnight expedition of "benevolent assimilation" to a water melon patch or a hen coop?

As the next election in California approaches, the Democrats of that state are beginning to discuss their

prospects and purposes. Certain leaders, those who wear the uniform of Democracy but often camp in the tents of the plutocrats, are urging the nomination of a safe, conservative, and—as the San Francisco Star appropriately adds—"a weak man, who is not known to have any opinions on great public questions, or who, having opinions, has kept them carefully bottled up and hermetically sealed." The Star does not want such a candidate. It wants no mere orator, who will recount "the glorious deeds of the fathers" while ignoring our departure from their teachings; it wants no little reformer without sincere convictions; it wants no boss's tool. What it demands is—

that a clear-cut declaration of really democratic principles be adopted, and that the party's standard bearer be not one who sulked in his tent in the Bryan campaigns, and whose voice has never been uplifted for industrial and political freedom, but a man of the people, and known to the people as the upholder and defender of all the rights to which the Declaration of Independence says man is entitled, and which the Constitution of the United States once guaranteed.

That is about what is needed not only by the Democratic party in California, but also by the Democratic party of the nation.

In the issue of the Commoner of March 7, Mr. Bryan considers David B. Hill as a presidential candidate. There is nothing obtrusive in Mr. Bryan's having done this, for the Manhattan club banquet at New York was as undisguised an effort to place Mr. Hill in the foreground for the Democratic nomination as could possibly be made. It would not have been more pronounced either on his own part or on the part of this club, which, by the way, is said to have supported McKinley in 1896, had he worn a label inscribed in big letters: "I am a Democrat and am a Candidate for President." But Hill's presidential prospects are blighted. If Mr. Wood's speech at the banquet, which is now gaining considerable circulation in the Democratic press, did not assure the spoilsmen present that they were

on the wrong scent, Mr. Bryan's editorial on "The Candidacy of Mr. Hill" will be pretty certain to do so. It is moderate in tone, comprehensive in matter, clear cut in statement, complete in argument, acute in political perception, sincere in spirit, definite in purpose, and thorough in its dignified castigation of this played-out pretender. In his whole career Mr. Bryan has never done a better piece of politico-editorial work.

One of the most pronounced plutocratic Democrats of the country is St. Clair McKelway, editor of the Brooklyn Eagle, which he conducts against the policy and principles but in the name of the Democratic party. His constant cry is that the Democratic party should be "affirmative" and not "negative;" his idea of affirmative being "the going thing," right or wrong. Were Mr. McKelway to fall out of a third story window it is to be supposed that he would scorn to catch on to the sill and climb back, because that would be in the nature of "negation." His frequent repetition of his poll parrot criticism of the Democratic party has drawn out the following thoughtful rebuke from the Albany Argus:

If Mr. McKelway demands something new of the party, as the price of his support, he ought to give us something new himself, and not a rehash of Republican criticisms of the Democratic party.

Senator Hoar has made it pretty clear that he, for one, will not support the proposed amendment of the Constitution for the election of United States senators by the people. As he has only informally expressed his hostile views, and the resolution is still buried in committee, no special reply is called for at this time. But an objection has been proposed by a Washington paper called the Savings Journal, which might prove useful to Mr. Hoar and the other senators on his side of the question. We quote:

When a man owes his election to Congress directly to the people, he feels under obligations to those people and he realizes that, if he fails to do what they desire, he probably

will not be reelected. So there has arisen in the national house of representatives a tendency to shirk certain unpopular legislation by forcing the Senate to take the definite steps. If the senators should be elected by the direct vote, they would probably be as chary of unpopular measures as the representatives now are.

Nothing is lacking to make this point decisive except an explanation of why, under "a government of the people, for the people and by the people," legislative bodies should not be "chary of unpopular measures."

Senators Bacon of Georgia, and Patterson of Colorado, are presenting a vigorous and intelligent opposition to the Hoar "lese majesty" bill. This bill appears upon its face to be simply a measure to punish, in Federal tribunals, murder committed or attempted upon a president or any person in succession to the presidency. But a moment's reflection will show that it is essentially a measure to define and punish as treason, acts which cannot be made treason. The bill does not confine its proposed pains and penalties to attempts upon the life of a president made in resistance to the exercise of his lawful authority, but applies them to such attempts upon him personally without regard to whether they are made in resistance to his lawful authority or not. In the case of officials in succession, no question of resistance could be involved. The bill is therefore not at all like the familiar laws for punishing assaults upon marshals, mail carriers, etc., to obstruct them in the performance of official duty. It would not be a special law for the protection of an official function; it would be a special law for the special protection of one special class of persons. It would create a sort of sacred royal family, to attack whom would be treason even if not so named in the law.

While Congress is thus considering the propriety of creating a species of treason which the constitution forbids, the legislature of New York is diligently trying to throttle free speech. The judiciary committee of the state senate has reported a bill for

the repression of anarchy. That it does not aim merely at physical force anarchy—nor at all, for that matter, since the crimes which this involves are already covered by the penal code—but at the suppression of legitimate freedom of speech, is not left to conjecture; for the judiciary committee, in its report upon the bill, boldly unmasks its purpose. Says this report:

Organized government must be maintained. To attack it, to preach the doctrine that it should not be maintained, is not the right of any one. On the contrary, such attack threatens the liberty and safety of every citizen and is more dangerous to the people of the republic than would be the repeal of the constitutional guarantees themselves.

Accordingly this vicious bill would make what it calls anarchist meetings unlawful, irrespective of the question of whether disturbance or force is resorted to or even contemplated. It would also make it criminal to advocate the doctrines of extreme individualism, either by speech or writing. As a rule, legislation of this sort meets with such unqualified approval from the Republican press that it is a pleasure to quote a prominent Republican paper against it. The quotation is from the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Times of the 7th. It might be expedient, observes that paper, before enacting the bill—

to go through the preliminary formality of submitting to a vote of the people, by the usual method, a resolution amending the state constitution by eliminating section 8 of Article I., which ordains that "every citizen may freely speak, write or publish his sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that right; and no law shall be passed to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech or of the press."

What follows in the same paper is even more gratifying as an indication of a revival of democratic theories of republican government in political places where they have recently seemed to have become asphyxiated:

It is needless for the Brooklyn Times to disclaim any sympathy for the doctrines of the anarchists; equally needless to waste space at present in denouncing them. But indeed the suggestion that "the repeal of the constitutional guarantees" of our liberties would be preferable to the toleration of

doctrinaire attacks on accepted theories of government—the suggestion embodied in this precious report—savors more strongly of anarchy than anything that the avowed anarchists have recently said in public. . . . Society and organized government have nothing to fear from the the open discussion of the theories of the anarchist, for when he is required to define his ideas and formulate his plan of social life in a community with no law but the will of the individual, the impracticability of the proposition readily becomes apparent even to himself; it is the attempt at forcible repression of the ideas of anarchy that has enabled it to gain such foothold as it has, and given it the character of a murderous conspiracy against life and property, against religion and order. The law should be so framed as to make every incitement to crime or immorality a crime punishable with severe penalties, but the law will defeat its own purpose and strengthen the evil it is intended to cure if it goes further than this, and makes open philosophical speculation and debate a crime. The attempts to overthrow the safeguards which the framers of the constitution placed around the right of the people to free thought and free speech, so long as there is no incitement to disorder, and no infringement of the rights of others, is in itself an offense of no inconsiderable magnitude. The Times does not permit itself to doubt that the free citizens of New York will be prompt to rebuke and defeat it.

In one of the committees of the Senate there is a resolution, introduced by Senator Bacon, which should be dug out and acted upon at once and favorably. It is intended to authorize the distribution of the Congressional Record at the rate of \$2 for the long session and \$1 for the short session. The present price is \$8 for each session, a price so high that few persons get the publication except through the personal favor of congressmen, who are entitled ex-officio to a limited number of free copies. If the price were reduced as proposed, this much sneered at but most instructive public document would be more extensively circulated and more generally read. We know of no better means of education in the politics of popular government than the Record offers. Few would care to read everything in it. Fewer would have the time. And to no one would this task be of any reasonable use. But general

familiarity with the Record, and verbal reading of its more important contents, are necessary to make an intelligent citizen. The newspaper reports of congressional proceedings are not a good substitute. If the Record were more generally read, congressional proceedings would be better understood by the people and congressional standards would consequently improve. By all means let the Record be published at popular prices.

THE OLIMAX OF THE PROTECTIVE SUPERSTITION.*

At the risk of being suspected as a Greek bearing gifts, I should like to ask protectionists—those who believe in protectionism upon principle, of course, and not the trusts that seek protection merely for their own interests, and whose members greedily appropriate its benefits to their own private use—to consider very thoughtfully the probable effect of ship subsidies upon the popularity of their cherished doctrine.

Subsidies are unquestionably in line with the protective idea, for they are one of the modes of “encouraging domestic industry” by means of taxation. But they are altogether too candidly direct in method and too recklessly transparent in purpose. The masses of the people may feel their burdens, even under our indirect system of taxation; and are certain to recognize their plundering character. Is it wise, then, for sincerely philanthropic and patriotic protectionists to risk the possibilities of exposure of the essential nature of protection to which this all too candid mode of application will subject it?

For my part, I am quite willing to concede the superiority, for the purpose of protection to home industry, of subsidies paid directly out of the public treasury, over subsidies paid by consumers of domestic goods indirectly to the beneficiaries under compulsion of protective tariffs. The direct subsidy is better for many reasons.

In the first place, it is open and above board. Everybody can know

*Written for and published by the American Free Trade League, Tremont Building, Boston, being No. 30 in its series of syndicate articles for 1901-02, and bearing date Feb. 17, 1902. By Louis F. Post, Editor of The Public.

who gets it, and how much he gets. Everybody can know, also, whether those who do get it divide up fairly with their workingmen, according to the true intent of the law. Of the indirect, or protective tariff subsidies, that is not true. The beneficiaries can, and in practice actually do, conceal their plunder. It comes from so many individual sources, and in ways so various and complicated, that no one can keep track of it except the beneficiaries themselves. In consequence, their workingmen are systematically robbed of the share which protective laws design that they should receive. The only recourse of workingmen is to strike when they suspect an unfair division, and that is very unsatisfactory all around. In this respect alone, the direct subsidy has marked advantages over the protective tariff subsidy.

Another of its relative advantages is its effect upon the public at large.

The object of both methods is to encourage domestic production. But here the tariff method operates with great and harassing awkwardness. In order to encourage the production of woolen goods, for instance, obstructions are put in the way of the importation of foreign woolsens. Those that are imported commercially are subjected to import taxes, which increase the price not only to the amount of the tax but also to the amount of several commercial profits upon the tax; while those that are imported by travelers cause their owners no end of annoyance, to say nothing of the expense, when they land at a home port.

All this extra cost and annoyance must be submitted to until the domestic product has been brought up to the standard of the competing foreign article. Nor does the burden fall off then. For when the domestic product reaches the foreign standard of quality and price, its protected manufacturers insist upon having the protective tariff continued, to enable them to “invade” foreign markets in the name of American enterprise, this invasion consisting in selling their goods at free trade prices abroad, while maintaining protection prices at home.

And that is not all. Sheep raisers clamor for protective tariffs on wool, to enable them to force their prod-

uct upon the domestic woolen manufacturers, who force their product upon tailors; and tailors clamor for protective tariffs upon clothing to enable them to recoup the extra price they have to pay for cloth.

Protective tariffs are thus piled up all along the line, from the item of the growers of the raw materials to that of the last touch upon the finished product. For what? Simply to build up an infant industry and to enable it to invade foreign markets after it has been built up. Is a more wasteful method conceivable? Compare that expensive and harassing process of indirect subsidies with the direct subsidy, and note how indescribably superior the latter is.

Under the direct subsidy nobody would be annoyed by custom house officers while the infant industry was growing to maturity. The disadvantages under which the American producer labored being overcome by subsidies paid out of the public treasury, his goods would enter the domestic market at lower prices than the foreign goods. Consequently foreign goods would stay out, except to the extent that the domestic producer was unable fully to meet the home demand, which would be only in the infantile years of his industry. During that period he would be encouraged by having as much of the home market secured to him as he could supply; while home consumers would not be pestered with custom house regulations in order to procure from abroad what he could not supply, nor be burdened with excessive prices for either the foreign or the domestic article. And although the American people would have to pay the direct subsidy, they would not also have to pay profits upon it every time the subsidized goods changed hands in trade, as they must under a protective tariff.

The same advantageous difference would continue after the domestic goods had been brought to the level of the foreign standard, and the home market could be fully supplied. They could then be sold at home at a price low enough to keep out the foreign article, and, thanks to the subsidy, could also be sent abroad to undersell foreign goods in their own market.

Other reasons might be urged were space abundant. But enough has been said to show the superiority of the direct subsidy system. Whether for the purpose of building up an infant industry at home, or of enabling it to invade foreign markets after it is built up, indirect subsidies through protective tariffs are vastly inferior to direct subsidies paid out of the public treasury.

But the direct subsidy has also great disadvantages. It is simple. It is easily understood. It is manifestly for the benefit of special interests, and not for the general good. And, withal, it is certain, if overdone—a fate which attends upon all protective methods—to end speedily in an outburst of indignant ridicule. These do not sound like disadvantages; and, so far as the public is concerned, they are not. But they are serious disadvantages from the protection point of view. Such a method of encouraging domestic industry might, if once it were adopted, everlastingly discredit the whole protection theory. That is reason enough for the shyness which shrewd protectionists have heretofore exhibited toward direct subsidies for industrial encouragement.

Lately, however, the fat and greedy beneficiaries of protective tariffs, finding no longer any profit for themselves in that method of taxing Peter to enrich Paul, have been turning with favor toward the direct subsidy system. The first step, the sugar bounty, was not encouraging. It was a mistake to begin with a product like sugar. The purely private nature of this bounty was too obvious. For a beginning, shipping bounties are better. The people know but little about the modern shipping business, and they are ambitious to boast of a great mercantile navy. Subsidies for ships, therefore, do not seem so much as bounties on sugar, like private gifts, even if the chief beneficiaries of the subsidies are to be the great trust magnates of the country.

But if the system of subsidies once takes root in shipping bounties, is any one so fatuous as to believe that it will end there? Let the protective tariff system answer. Its multitudinous ramifications and the horde of beggars in all kinds of industrial ex-

ploitation clamoring for its favors, abundantly testify that there is no limit to public gifts for private benefit short of the will and ability of the giver.

Let ship owners be subsidized out of the public treasury, and a cry for similar direct subsidies will go up from every industry that cannot make the indirect subsidies of the protective tariff serve it. If ships, why not exports? European nations, now cited as examples of ship subsidizers, do subsidize some exports with a view to the commercial invasion of other countries. Shall we shrink from equipping our exporters for that kind of warfare? It has been seen how one tariff breeds another. Why shall not one subsidy breed another. There is no reason for confining subsidies to the encouragement of international trade. If it is good public policy to subsidize ships for foreign commerce, it must be good public policy to subsidize ships and railroads for domestic commerce. If it is good public policy to subsidize commodities for export, it must be good public policy to subsidize commodities for home consumption. Does any one doubt, at any rate, that these extensions of subsidies can be urged as plausibly as the ship subsidy, on grounds of public policy? If, for example, a protective tariff on wool for the protection of American sheep could be made an issue in national politics, why not a subsidy on wool, now that the protective tariff fails to protect it?

Protectionists who believe that protection is a legitimate public policy should make no mistake about the ship subsidy question. With ship subsidies for a starting point and precedent, there will be no end to the objects vociferously seeking subsidies, and no conceivable end to those getting them. But long before the possible end is reached, the whole thing will strike the American sense of humor as unspeakably ridiculous, and the subsidy system, with the protective system of which it is part, will collapse.

Since that is a consummation which free traders devoutly wish for, they might be quizzically asked why they object to this protection-destroying system of subsidies. It might be

urged that the ship subsidy should be welcomed by them as an ally. But free traders are not playing in a game. They are not opposing protection for sport. They oppose it because, whatever may be the mode of application, it is in practice destructive to wholesome industry and in principle economically false and morally pernicious.

The subsidy movement is the normal culmination of a long era of protection by tariffs. In that era a few gigantic trusts, promoted and buttressed if not caused by protection, have developed. They hold the fate of legitimate industry almost at their mercy, and threaten even the political integrity of the republic. They have perverted the intellectual standard of schools and colleges. They have polluted the moral atmosphere of churches. They have insinuated their influence into newspaper sanctums. They have dictated policies in legislative assemblies, seated their own professional servants upon the judicial bench, corrupted nominating conventions, and by trick and device diverted the course of public opinion itself. And now, glutted with pelf and drunken with power, they cynically propose to rob the public boldly, directly from the public treasury, as for a generation they have been robbing it stealthily by means of protective tariffs.

That in doing this they will cause the whole protection edifice to crumble is reasonably to be expected. But that much-desired ending of the most absurd and demoralizing superstition of economic history, is not a reason for advocating subsidies as the destructive means. This would indeed be doing evil that good might come. Much more to the honor of American intelligence and American sensitiveness to right and justice would it be for American citizenship to condemn the protective scheme with deliberation, than to leave it to the fates.

Rather than approve the shipping subsidy, though in the reasonable hope that its development would expose the absurd iniquity of protection and loosen the grasp of that superstition, all conscientious and intelligent citizens will demand that the shipping subsidy be condemned because it is one of the forms of that superstition. Free traders would

rather kill protection with the club of common sense or the sword of common justice, than help to poison it with an overdose of subsidies, however reconciled they might be to seeing it so poisoned by its friends.

DR. L. B. TUCKERMAN.

Outside of the medical societies, in which he was an active member, and beyond the city of Cleveland, where his medical practice was large and his personality familiar, Dr. Tuckerman's fame had but slightly extended. In Cleveland, however, his reputation as a citizen had been for years as general as it was unique. It is a reputation, too, which is more likely to spread and grow with time than to fade.

Of Dr. Tuckerman, Tom L. Johnson, now the mayor of Cleveland, is reported by the local press to have said several years ago that he regarded him as "the best citizen of Cleveland," because "he is always striving for the best interests of all the people and he has devoted his life unselfishly to the alleviation of suffering and the promotion of civic righteousness." This estimate of Tuckerman was repeated by the mayor upon learning of the doctor's sudden death, which occurred on the 5th, when he was barely 52 years of age. Nor was it an empty compliment. For in fact Dr. Tuckerman's devotion to public interests, and in no narrow or mere "patriotic" way, either, was both singular and weariless. And this devotion is to be publicly acknowledged at a meeting now being arranged upon a large scale, to be held on Sunday the 16th by progressive citizens of Cleveland.

A democrat of strong convictions, his intolerance of the undemocratic influences so long dominant in the Democratic party, made Dr. Tuckerman a populist in politics and afterward a member of the Socialist party, of which he was the candidate for school director at the time of his death. His socialism was not distinctly of the "scientific" order. It did not rest upon the materialistic philosophy nor cling to the class lines, of the socialism which is becoming in this country as in Germany the dominant type; but would have to be classified with the miscellaneous kinds,

of which there is a great variety, usually to be found outside instead of inside the Socialist party. Dr. Tuckerman was doubtless the father of the agitation for municipal ownership of public utilities in Cleveland, which has now gained such enormous headway there.

His early training in public affairs was under abolition influences in the famous Western Reserve; and to the time of his death the inspiring ideals of absolute right in human relationships, which made that movement invincible, remained his pillar of cloud by day and his pillar of fire by night. A public character developed conscientiously under the guidance of that principle, and which makes so deep an impression upon his community as Dr. Tuckerman is conceded to have made upon Cleveland, cannot but be remembered with increasing distinctness and grateful affection by everyone who may have come within the range of its influence.

JOHN S. MURPHY.

Another man of moral valor and civic power in his own community, is numbered this week among those whose days of fighting for the truth as it comes to them are over. The death of John S. Murphy, long the editor of the Dubuque Telegraph, and, after its consolidation with the Herald, of the Dubuque Telegraph-Herald, is announced in the issue of that paper of the 11th. Mr. Murphy was one of the leading newspaper men of Iowa, guiding the policy of a daily paper that stood in the foreground of state journalism; and in the Democratic party of the state he was a valued counselor, in convention and committee room as well as in the editorial sanctum. A democratic-Democrat, and withal a single tax advocate of clear perceptions and the intelligence as well as the courage of his convictions, his services to the Democratic party were dictated by the highest motives and distinguished by rare good judgment. On one occasion his loyalty was put to a severe test, but he stood it without flinching. Though dependent upon an editorial salary for the support of his family, he promptly laid down the editorial control of the Telegraph and sacrificed the much needed salary, rather than

stand sponsor for the advocacy by the owners of the paper of a 99-year charter for the old Dubuque street railway company. No better obituary could any true man wish for than that which is contributed to Mr. Murphy's memory in the editorial columns of a rival paper, the Dubuque Times:

With a heart full of sympathy for the weak, a noble aspiration for service to society, with a soul and intellect that gave him splendid courage and rare eloquence in the defense of any cause that appealed to his sympathies, John S. Murphy won the affections and the admiration of thousands. His life's work suddenly ended, its influence survives in their hearts. His lofty purposes remain as a heritage to the generation he sought to serve, while by those long and intimately associated with him in his work the memory of his kindness, gentleness and patience and the warmth and loyalty of his friendship will be treasured as his choicest influence and example.

NEWS

The war in South Africa continues to be the center of news interest; and, owing to an event of the current week, a news center of extraordinary importance. This event is a battle in which the Boers gained a startling victory and numbered among their prisoners the distinguished British general Methuen, the senior officer in South Africa next to Lord Kitchener.

Complete reports of the battle are not yet at hand. Lord Kitchener telegraphed the general facts on the 8th from Pretoria and they were made public in parliament on the 10th. According to this dispatch Gen. Methuen "was moving with 900 mounted men, under Maj. Paris, and 300 infantry, 4 guns and a pom-pom, from Winburg to Lichtenburg," when the attack was made. Winburg is in the Orange Free State, about 70 miles northeast from Bloemfontein; and Lichtenburg is in the South African Republic, about 25 miles east of Mafeking. The two points are about 150 miles apart, Winburg being the more southern. The best known places in the region between these extremes are Kroonstad, Potchefstroom and Klerksdorp. Gen. Methuen was to have effected a junction on the 8th with Gen. Grenfell, who, commanding 1,300 mounted men,

left Klerksdorp for that purpose; but early on the morning of the 7th he was attacked by Gen. Delarey, with a force estimated at 1,500, between Taaibasch and Palmietknill, and, his force being thrown into confusion, he lost his guns and baggage and was himself taken prisoner. At Lord Kitchener's request this dispatch was withheld from publication by the British government at London until the receipt of a second one, dated the 10th, had confirmed the discouraging news of the first. The second dispatch told of the return of Maj. Paris with the remnant of Methuen's force. They reported that the attack had been made just before dawn, and that the British rear guard broke before reinforcements could come up, throwing men, mules and wagons into confusion. Maj. Paris collected a few men and made a sturdy defense, but at 10 o'clock in the forenoon was compelled to surrender. The British loss thus far reported, besides guns and baggage, was 41 killed, 77 wounded, and 201 missing. Though Gen. Methuen was retained as a prisoner, Maj. Paris appears to have been released. When last seen, Gen. Methuen was being well cared for in his own wagon, though suffering from a fractured thigh.

When the news of this disaster was announced in the House of Commons on the 10th, the Irish members cheered; but the general feeling both in the House and in the country is reported to have been more depressed and gloomy than at any time since the British disasters of 1899. This feeling has been intensified since the 11th by a general fear that Grenfell's force, which was to have effected a junction with Methuen on the 8th, has also suffered disaster, nothing having been heard from it since it left Klerksdorp. British reinforcements are being ordered out from London and the determination to pursue the "unconditional surrender" policy is asserted to be unrelaxed.

It is evident that there is very little American sentiment in sympathy with that attitude of the British government, while sympathy with the Boers is expressing itself with growing emphasis. The matter came up in Congress on the 7th, when Representative Burleson, of Texas, introduced a resolution calling upon the Secretary of State to explain why he refused to ask permission of the British government (p. 740) for the Rev.

Hiram W. Thomas and his wife to go to the British reconcentrado camps in South Africa, for the purpose of distributing relief funds collected under the authority of Gov. Yates. Mr. Burleson addressed the House on this resolution on the 11th, declaring his purpose to be to fasten the attention of the American people on the pro-British course of the state department. There was also a large popular demonstration at Joliet, Ill., on the 11th, one of an increasing number of public meetings in the West in protest against the attitude of the American government toward the British in the South African war. It was addressed by ex-Gov. Altgeld, of Illinois, on 18 specified points, the substance of which is printed in our Miscellany department this week; and the occasion was made sadly but impressively dramatic by the death of Gov. Altgeld in consequence of his effort and soon after the close of his speech.

Mr. Altgeld, though apparently in excellent physical condition at the beginning of his speech, grew weak toward its close; but rousing himself he delivered the peroration with his usual oratorical power, except that he stammered slightly toward the end as if confused. Having finished, and while the audience was yet applauding his splendid effort, he fell in a faint; and although he afterward recovered consciousness for a time, physicians pronounced his ailment an attack of apoplexy, and at 7 o'clock on the following morning, March 12, he died.

Born in Prussia, December 30, 1847, Altgeld came to this country with his parents when three years of age. His parents settled on a farm, in Ohio, and his early life was hard and his opportunities for acquiring an education poor. In 1864 he enlisted in the Union army, and fought as a private through the James river campaign. At the close of the war he worked his way through an academy, and after teaching in Ohio went, penniless and on foot — what we should now call a tramp — to St. Louis and thence to Kansas and Northwestern Missouri, where he taught school and studied law, working on farms at intervals. He was admitted to the bar in 1870, in Missouri, where he served for a time as city attorney of Savannah and then as state's attorney for Andrew county. In 1875 he came to Chicago. Here he built up a large practice and made

fortunate investments which gave him the reputation by 1889 of being a millionaire. He was defeated for congress in 1884, but elected judge of the superior court of Cook county in 1886. He resigned this office in 1891 and in 1892 was elected governor of Illinois. As candidate for a second term he was defeated in 1896, after which he resumed the practice of his profession and was fast forging to the front again at the Chicago bar when he died. Altgeld's fortune was undermined while he occupied the governor's chair, in consequence, it is said, of his official hostility to the plans of the large private monopoly interests of Chicago, and he died a poor man. While governor he distinguished himself by defeating important monopoly legislation, by opposing the invasion of Illinois by national troops without the constitutional prerequisite of a demand from the state executive, and by pardoning the imprisoned "anarchists" on the express ground, the evidence for which he presented in detail, that the jury which found them guilty had been packed to convict. Within the past few weeks Gov. Altgeld delivered three of the greatest speeches of his life—a life noted for great speeches. One was at Ann Arbor, on "Democracy;" another was at Buffalo, on the public ownership of public service monopolies; and the third was at Joliet, on the war in South Africa and the pro-British partisanship in that war of the American government. It was at the conclusion of this speech that he died.

A few days prior to ex-Gov. Altgeld's death a decision invalidating the anti-trust law of this state, enacted during his administration as governor, was made by the Supreme Court of the United States. The anti-trust law of Illinois defines a trust as "a combination of capital, skill or acts by two or more persons, firms, corporations or associations of persons" for restricting trade, for reducing production, for increasing prices, or for preventing competition; but it makes an exception of "agricultural products or live stock while in the hands of the producer or raiser." It is this exception that was held by the highest court to invalidate the law. The case in which the decision was made arose on a claim of the sewer pipe trust against a firm of dealers in sewer pipe. The claim was resisted by the dealers, who, as a defense, set up the anti-trust law of Illinois, one section of which pro-

vides that defendants sued by a trust may defeat the suit by pleading the anti-trust statute. Judge Harlan wrote the opinion of the United States Supreme Court, which decides that the act is in contravention of the fourteenth amendment to the Federal constitution declaring that "no state shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." For, inasmuch as the Illinois anti-trust law provides that—

all except producers of agricultural commodities and raisers of live stock who combine their capital, skill or acts for any of the purposes named in the act may be punished as criminals, while agriculturists and live stock raisers, in respect of their products or live stock in hand, are exempted from the operation of the statute, and so far as the statute is concerned may combine and do that which if done by others would be a crime against the state—

therefore, an unconstitutional distinction is made. In elucidation of the point Judge Harlan says:

Persons engaged in general trade or in the sale of merchandise and commodities, and agriculturists and raisers of live stock, are all in the same general class—that is, they are all alike engaged in domestic trade or commerce, as such trade or commerce may be involved in the sale and purchase of goods, articles, commodities, agricultural products and live stock. Such commerce is, of right, open to all, subject to such regulations, applicable alike to all in like conditions, as the state may legally prescribe. The difficulty is not met by saying that, generally speaking, the state may in its discretion and for the public good, make a classification of persons, firms, corporations and associations, in order to subserve the public interests. For this court has held that classification "must always rest upon some difference which bears a reasonable and just relation to the act in respect to which the classification is proposed, and can never be made arbitrarily and without any such basis. . . . But arbitrary selection can never be justified by calling it classification. The equal protection demanded by the fourteenth amendment forbids this. . . . No duty rests more imperatively upon the courts than the enforcement of those constitutional provisions intended to secure that equality of rights which is the foundation of free government. . . . It is apparent that the mere fact of classification is not sufficient to relieve a statute from the reach of the equality clause of the fourteenth amendment, and that in all cases it must appear not only that a classification has been made, but also that it is one based upon some reason-

able ground—some difference which bears a just and proper relation to the attempted classification—and is not a mere arbitrary selection.

The whole act was invalidated on account of this fatal exception, because the court could not separate the exception from the prohibition without in effect legislating upon the subject. The legislators not having agreed to make the prohibition apply to all persons, the court could not do it for them. This is in accord with a long established and reasonable principle of constitutional law.

The suit under the Federal anti-trust law to suppress the Northern Securities company, of New Jersey, into which certain northwestern railroads are merging (referred to at p. 746), has now been actually begun. The suit is brought in the name of the United States as plaintiff and against the Northern Securities company, the Great Northern Railway company, the Northern Pacific railway and other parties affected; and the bill in equity, by which it was begun, was filed on the 10th in the United States circuit court for the district of Minnesota. A charge of combination and conspiracy in restraint of trade is made in the bill and an injunction is asked for. There have as yet been no further proceedings.

Further action has been taken in the legislature of Colorado with reference to the Bucklin tax amendment (p. 761), which seems to assure, without possibility of recall, its submission to popular vote at the election next fall. As reported last week, the Senate had on the 1st postponed consideration of the bill to repeal the submission clause of the amendment; resolution until April 15, a date beyond the probable time of adjournment; but there were still similar bills pending in the lower House. These are now practically disposed of, though, like the bill in the Senate, not absolutely. The matter came up in the House on the 7th, but action was delayed by a recess. On the 8th, however, a motion to postpone the consideration of all bills proposing to repeal the submission clause of the Bucklin amendment until after all revenue legislation shall have been disposed of by both houses was adopted by a vote of 31 to 27. This is regarded as equivalent to indefinite postponement.

Of kindred interest to the Bucklin fiscal movement, in Colorado is the

Johnson street car movement in Cleveland, Ohio. At the time of our last report (p. 760-61), two phases of the subject were uppermost. One of them related to the efforts of the old street car companies, whose franchises will soon expire, to bribe franchise owners to withdraw consents given to the new 3-cent fare road which Mayor Johnson is seeking to establish with a municipal ownership option reserved to the city in the franchise. To head off this hostile movement, the city and Mr. Hoefgen, the only bidder for the new franchise, procured an injunction. The question of continuing the injunction was argued before Judge Philipps, who decided on the 8th against the old companies. Holding that the interference complained of was against public policy, he made the injunction permanent. Another proceeding, intended to prevent the old companies from stopping the passage of the new road through a long street having four different names at different points in its length, by securing adverse action by a majority of the lotholders on one of the short sections of this street, was an ordinance before the city council to give the street but one name along its whole length. The ordinance passed its second reading on the 3d (p. 760), and coming up for third reading on the 10th, it was adopted after a long and exciting debate by 12 to 6. This is regarded as a test vote on the 3-cent franchise measure, which is to come before the council for final action on the 17th.

The old street car companies of Cleveland have entered into the consolidation arrangements noted at page 743. As foreshadowed by the Cleveland Plain Dealer's report of the 6th, these arrangements have evidently been strongly influenced by Mayor Johnson's 3-cent fare crusade. Says the Plain Dealer:

Involved in this street car deal are arrangements for vast improvements, for universal transfers and in all probability for the sale of six tickets for 25 cents, although this latter detail has not been positively settled as yet. . . . Stock to the value of \$21,600,000 is involved, of which \$13,000,000 represents Big Consolidated stock, and \$8,600,000 the stock of the Little Consolidated. By the terms of the agreement all Big Consolidated stock is to go into the general pool at \$80 a share, the Little Consolidated to go in at \$120 a share, or the Big Consolidated will go in at \$100 a share while the Little Consolidated will go

in at \$140 a share. . . . In the terms as already agreed to Senator Hanna is to become the president of the consolidated roads, which are to be operated under the name of the Cleveland Electric Railway company. . . . It was admitted yesterday that the consolidation which has been more or less talked of for years was hastened and really made possible by the progress of the three-cent fare fight being conducted under the leadership of Mayor Johnson. By being one great company the old street railway interests of Cleveland will be enabled to deal with the three-cent fare proposition with a united front. . . . In connection with the details of the giant consolidation comes the announcement of improvements of a most sweeping character, the object in view being the finest equipped street railway properties in the United States from the standpoint of the public.

Labor disturbances of a serious character are reported from Boston. Thousands of teamsters, freight handlers, longshoremen, switchmen and clerks have struck work. The freight business of all New England has been crippled, while business in Boston is almost paralyzed. A gang of organized freight handlers employed by the New York, New Haven & Hartford railroad struck on the 7th. They were ordered to help unload a dray and before obeying they asked the teamster in charge of the dray and of its load to show his card as a member of the teamsters' union. He was not a union man and had no card. The freight handlers therefore refused to work with him and were summarily discharged, whereupon all the freight handlers of the N. Y., N. H. & H. "walked out." The company, refusing to reconsider, the allied unions have come to the support of the original strikers until at this time the number out is estimated at 30,000. The governor, the state board of conciliation, and the mayor have tried in vain to bring about an understanding. While the strikers consent to arbitration, the railroad is obdurate. The matter had become desperate on the 11th, when Mayor Collins telegraphed Senator Hanna as follows:

Serious strike of teamsters, expressmen and freight handlers now on against railroads and other transportation managers. Promises to spread unless immediately checked by wise and authoritative counsel and this may be as calamitous as San Francisco strike. Seems to me an occasion to invoke influence of

Civic Federation, and I therefore appeal to you.

Mr. Hanna replied on the same day:

Telegram received. If you will point out a way I will be glad to be of service. We should have indications from both sides that our good offices would be acceptable.

The mention in this correspondence of the Civic Federation refers to the permanent arbitration board (p. 583) organized by the National Civic Federation, of which Senator Hanna is chairman.

NEWS NOTES.

—President Roosevelt signed the Philippine tariff bill (pp. 745, 763) on the 8th.

—The Danish folkething voted by a large majority on the 11th to ratify the treaty (p. 730) of cession to the United States of the Danish West Indies.

—Dr. Francisco de Paula Rodrigues Alves, governor of the Brazilian state of Sao Paulo, has been elected president of Brazil and will be inaugurated November 15 next.

—The legislature of Kentucky has passed a bill disfranchising women at school elections. This was done because the last election in Lexington was determined by the votes of Negro women.

—The seventy-fifth birthday of Murray F. Tuley, the Chicago judge whose fame as an able and democratic jurist is national, was celebrated on the 6th by the Chicago Bar association.

—The New York Sun having changed owners, the protracted strike of compositors has been settled and the paper is once more a union office. Senator Hanna is credited with having effected the settlement.

—Secretary Long, of the Navy, resigned on the 10th, the resignation to take effect on the 1st of May; and William L. Moody, a representative in Congress from Massachusetts, has been offered and has accepted an appointment from the president as Mr. Long's successor.

—Upon arriving in Boston (p. 762) on the 6th, Prince Henry became the guest of the city and received from Harvard university the degree of doctor of laws. On the 7th he was again in New York, on the 10th he went to Philadelphia, and on the 11th he embarked at Hoboken on the Deutschland, which sailed for Germany on the 12th.

—An attempt to prevent a vote on the advisory referendum in Chicago, for which over 104,000 voters have petitioned (p. 690), by proving that some of the signatures are fictitious,

has been defeated, the election commissioners having decided on the 12th in favor of the validity of the petition. In consequence the people of Chicago will vote at the coming municipal election on three questions: (1) Municipal ownership of street railroads; (2) municipal ownership of light and power; and (3) nominations of city officers at primary elections.

—The judiciary committee of the lower house of congress reported favorably, on the 11th, the bill to abolish government by injunction in labor disputes. This bill provides in substance that no agreement between persons to do or not to do any act in furtherance of any trade dispute between employers and employes shall be deemed criminal, nor shall such person be indictable for conspiracy, nor shall such agreement be considered in restraint of trade, nor shall any restraining order or injunction be issued in relation thereto.

—Upon signing the permanent census bill (p. 747) on the 6th, President Roosevelt notified the Secretary of the Interior to inform the Director of the Census that his office will continue to be administered as it has been administered until the first day of July, and that he is to appoint such members of the present force under him as will constitute the permanent census force, appointing only so many as are to be permanently employed. After that date all appointments are to be made under the regulations of the civil service act. This order is intended to prevent the unloading upon other bureaus of a census force, thrust by act of Congress into the classified service, which becomes superfluous in that bureau on the 1st of July.

PRESS OPINIONS.

JOHN P. ALTGELD.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), March 12.—He was absolutely without magnetism, yet he commanded admiration for his skill, directness, candor and courage.

New Haven Union (Dem.), March 9.—Gov. Altgeld's speech [public ownership of public monopoly] is a magnificent exposition of a subject that is of the most vital importance to every American citizen. It is certain to have an effect far beyond that of most spoken words.

Chicago Daily News (neut.), March 12.—All citizens of this state without regard to party have recognized Mr. Altgeld's ability and even his political opponents admitted his sincerity. . . . He will be remembered. . . . as a man of earnest convictions and as an advocate of all policies which in his belief tended toward a larger individual liberty for his fellow man.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), March 10.—Ex-Gov. Altgeld, of Illinois, delivered an address on public ownership, or in other words, whether the people shall own the monopolies, at Buffalo on Saturday. Of course it was able, fearless and in many respects original in its treatment of a great subject. There is very little that comes

from Gov. Altgeld in the way of discussion of current questions that has not these characteristics, whether you agree or disagree with his conclusions.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.), March 13.—John P. Altgeld, . . . was a bitter partisan, extreme in views and erratic in impulse, but neither his bitterness nor his eccentricity blinded his enemies or his friends to his exceptional ability and his honesty of purpose. . . . He owed his power over the discontented to that boldness and sturdiness that caused him often to sacrifice himself in the interest of a cause. This dominant trait in his character was illustrated in the last act of his life, and it will be remembered to his credit.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), March 13.—Taking the man as a whole he was sincere, even when assuming the extreme positions which brought on him the severest criticism. What he said he believed to be the truth, and to that alone may be ascribed his unabated popularity as a public speaker. He had no graces of oratory to tickle the populace. He could not fill their ears with fine-sounding sentences. Men went to listen to him because he was a man exceedingly in earnest, saying things which were unpleasant often, but which were known to be the genuine sentiments of the speaker.

Chicago Record-Herald (Rep.), March 13.—The fact is plain that he pursued the right as God gave him to see the right. He was a courageous champion of the people who had struggled so hard for success against the disadvantages of poverty that his sympathies remained true to the masses from whom he came. . . . A little book on oratory which he published within the last year or two . . . reveals his contempt for the shifts of expediency, his devotion to principle, his love and assiduous cultivation of the art of which he was no mean master, and a certain poetic fervor with which he was not generally credited.

Chicago Chronicle (cons. Dem.), March 13.—Ex-Gov. Altgeld was one of the greatest men intellectually who ever filled the governorship of Illinois. He was a man of highly original thought. The humane side of his nature was entitled to admiration. He was a friend of humanity in all the phases of its needs and sufferings. He was a man of genius. . . . He was a revolutionist in all his instincts and in the purposes which he followed. But he was a humane, not a destructive, revolutionist. Yet unless guided by the highest discretion and patriotism the impulses which he inspired in other men might become a serious menace to good government. As popularly understood his sympathies were with the lawless element in all disturbances growing out of labor controversies. This eccentricity was one of the blemishes on a character that was amiable and admirable in many general respects.

SHIP SUBSIDY BILL.

San Francisco Star (Dem.), March 8.—The fact is, the ship subsidy bill is vicious in principle, and is designed to aid private business at public expense. But Hanna and Frye want it, and it may pass.

Oshkosh Times (Dem.), March 6.—This is the third session of Congress in which Senator Frye has presented a ship subsidy measure, and this year, as heretofore, it seems to be drawn, not to promote American trade by encouraging the building of boats with large cargo space but to put money into the pockets of passenger lines which carry but little freight.

Farmers' Voice (agr.), March 8.—In the midst of the turmoil enters once more the shipping subsidy bill, which is now before the Senate as unfinished business, and therefore must be given precedence. This almost insures its passage by the Senate, as even the Democratic minority is likely

to give way before it rather than devote the entire session to its defeat; and that is what would have to be done if it is defeated, under the circumstances. It was a master play of the Hanna-Frye combine to get the measure before the Senate so early and thus produce this situation.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), March 4.—Most of our ocean trade is carried in foreign bottoms simply because the navigation laws deny American registry to foreign-built vessels. Were no restrictions placed on American purchase of vessels built in Europe, the American flag would dot every sea, and regardless of war between foreign nations our carrying facilities would be ample. To propose a bounty to increase the merchant marine is, therefore, a proposition to tax tens of millions out of the pockets of the people to attain an end which may be easily achieved without bounty.

TARIFF QUESTION.

Mascoutah (Ill.) Herald (Dem.), March 5.—The German protectionists may have sent Prince Henry over to find out how to put through a prohibitive tariff whip and spur. If not that, then he may be seeking to find how it is kept in force after it has proved a public hardship.

CAPITAL AND LABOR.

Buffalo Enquirer (Ind.), March 7.—Capital and labor are not at war, never have been and never will be. It is true that to the superficial and to those who have not analyzed the subject that the battle is waged between men on one side who have accumulated capital and those obliged to work for wages on the other. But a closer inspection will show that the disturbing factor—the one that is at the bottom of all industrial unrest—is pure monopoly.

DEMOCRATIC POLITICS.

Solon (Ia.) Economy (Ind.), March 6.—Mr. Hill's speech on the occasion put the Hill brand of democrats in the lead for a short time, but the speech of C. E. S. Wood, a prominent lawyer of Portland, Ore., seems to have scattered the hopes that were clustering around D. B. Hill as a prospective candidate on whom all Democrats would unite and be harmonious.

Chicago Record-Herald (Rep.), March 7.—Bryan is wholly justified in saying that Hill's position on the money question is that of artful dodger. The speech at the Manhattan club at New York is a clear case of dodge itself, and it recalls the time when most of the politicians were dodging and Hill was trying to be the most artful of them all.

Buffalo Review (neut.), March 3.—David B. Hill's recent declaration regarding the political situation would be laughable if it were not so pathetic. Certainly it is sad to see a man of Hill's ability juggling with words and striving to build a fabric of vapor which will serve for the purposes of a political platform in these days when the people demand plain speaking and unequivocal declarations.

Johnstown Democrat (Dem.), March 7.—The important matter in connection with both Hill and Gorman is that they are not Democrats in any vital sense. They are both representatives of plutocracy and . . . they are forcing themselves to the front now, not because they believe the Democrats will accept their discredited and essentially dishonest leadership, but because they hope to distract Democratic councils and foment Democratic faction. The plutocratic party needs such assistance just now.

Minneapolis Tribune (Rep.).—A Daalé came to judge the writing on the wall at the Belshazzar feast of the Democrats at the Manhattan club on Washington's birthday. . . . The man was C. E. S. Wood, of Oregon, a lawyer by vocation, and nearly everything that is intellectual and artistic and interesting by avocation—among

other things, a political and social idealist. . . . It is undeniable that this candid gentleman speaks for a large element of the western Democracy, with which the Hills and Whitneys and Gormans will have to reckon.

Buffalo Enquirer (ind.), March 8.—At the New York banquet there was present by chance an Oregon Democrat, who spoke in the unconventional way that most of the far Western men do. . . . This may not sound very harmonious to members who would banish principle and trust to promises of spoils for victory at the polls, but Mr. Wood expresses the sentiments of an increasing number of Western Democrats. Claptrap and political shrewdness may win temporary success, but they are poor things upon which to depend to build up the party or to make it the agency for protecting the people's rights against the encroachments of plutocracy.

TILLMAN-M'LAURIN EPISODE.

The Commoner (Dem.), March 7.—It is said that we love in others that which we lack ourselves. If the opposite is true, and we hate in others that which we find in ourselves, it may account for the fact that President Roosevelt condemned Senator Tillman's pugilistic tendencies by withdrawing the invitation to the white house.

BRITISH POLITICS.

Manchester Guardian (Lib.), Feb. 20.—Stated shortly, the Liberal policy in South Africa is a policy of peace by contract, a signed peace, a peace which the Boers would think tolerable, and by which they would accordingly undertake to abide. The Conservative policy is a policy of unconditional surrender—a policy, in Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's words, of "the ruin and practical annihilation of the Boer race;" a policy, as Lord Rosebery describes it, of "pounding the Boers to powder." What the Liberal Federation did yesterday afternoon and the Liberal leader yesterday evening was to try to enlist on the right side in this conflict of two principles everybody who, even with some qualifications and reserves, has expressed the right sympathies.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.), March 12.—Judged by the decisiveness of the conflict, the battle [capture of Gen. Methuen] was one of the most notable of the Boer war.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), March 12.—To a nation with the resources of Great Britain the loss inflicted by Gen. Delarey is slight. The troops and the military material can be replaced. The moral result, however, is not slight.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), March 11.—Either the well-worn pretense that only a disorganized kind of resistance is maintained by the Boers must be abandoned, or the admission made that the British troops in South Africa do not fight well.

Johnstown Democrat (Dem.), March 7.—The representatives of the murdered Boer republics met the same contemptuous reception at the White House from President Roosevelt which President McKinley gave the representatives of the murdered Philippine republics when they came to plead the cause of Filipino liberty.

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), March 6.—The two Boer representatives who came to this country from Europe to confer with Secretary of State Hay and President Roosevelt, received just such treatment as they had reason to expect, if they had reflected at all on the course that this government has taken in regard to the war in South Africa.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), March 7.—The reception of the Boer delegates, representing the South African republics, by the secretary of state and President Roosevelt was a very chilly affair to the Boers, although it will be received with enthusiasm in Great Britain, and by British sympa-

thizers in this country. . . . The Philippine blunder and crime closed the official lips; for what Britain has been doing in South Africa, Americans are doing under the orders of our government in the Philippines.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), March 7.—Mr. Hay's statement that the government has not the authority to "prevent the American farmer from shipping his stock to any part of the world he desired" is another insult to public intelligence. It is not the American farmer that is engaged in shipping this stock. . . . Agents of Great Britain are the ones who are "shipping the stock;" and it has not been forgotten that several months ago in the city of New Orleans, when a Federal court was applied to for an injunction restraining British agents from shipping horses and mules to be used in the South African war, the court held that the authority to prevent such shipment rested with the administration, because the offense involved the neutrality laws.

ANARCHY.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), Feb. 14.—The bill reported to the Senate for the protection of the President of the United States will be of little account save as a declaration of a wide public sentiment. Laws in our days do not protect the lives of rulers, as shown by the assassination of a czar, of a king of Italy, of a president of France and an empress of Austria, to say nothing of the real administrators, such as prime ministers.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 35 of that publication.

Senate.

Washington, March 3-8, 1902. Pursuant to the motion of the 1st, the Senate proceeded on the 3d with the consideration of Senate bill 1348, being the ship subsidy bill. The debate was opened by Mr. Frye (p. 2,448), who continued on the 4th (p. 2,499); and on the 5th—after the passage of the legislative, executive and judicial appropriations bill (pp. 2,635 to 2,641)—was followed (p. 2,541) by Mr. Clay, who closed on the 6th (p. 2,588). Mr. Clay was followed by Mr. Hanna (p. 2,588). Prior to the ship subsidy discussion on this day it was agreed that the ship subsidy bill shall be voted on at three o'clock on the 17th, without further debate (p. 2,563); and the bill for the protection of the president (S. bill, No. 3653) was discussed by Mr. Bacon (p. 2,583), and Mr. Patterson (p. 2,586). On the 7th the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill was passed (pp. 2,627-2,631), and the bill for the protection of the president further discussed by Mr. Bacon (p. 2,631), the shipping bill being informally laid aside after the proposal by Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi, of an amendment (p. 2,635) relative to the personal interest of congressmen and other public officials in the proposed subsidies. Adjournment was taken from the 7th to the 10th.

House.

On the 3d the House went into committee of the whole for the consideration of House bill, No. 11728, relative to rural free delivery in the postal service, the debate upon which was opened by Mr. Loud (p. 2,45), who was followed by Mr. Swanson (p. 2,470). The committee rose (p. 2,475) for the purpose of considering the conference report on the Philippine tariff bill, which had been adopted on the 1st (p. 2,428) by the Senate. The chairman of the ways and means committee, who had the floor, refused to yield more than 30 minutes to the opposition for debate, and, that being declined, moved the previous question, which was carried—105 to 83 (p. 2,479). The first business on the 4th was the adoption of the Philippine tariff conference report. It was adopted (p. 2,504) by a vote of 139 to 110. Consideration of the rural free delivery bill was then resumed; Mr. Landis (p. 2,506), Mr. Maddox (p. 2,506), Mr. Smith

(p. 2,511), Mr. Hill (p. 2,513) and Mr. Williams (p. 2,516), spoke upon it. After the report of the conferees on the pensions appropriation bill had been adopted (p. 2,544) on the 6th, consideration of the rural free delivery bill was again resumed, in committee of the whole, the committee being addressed by Mr. Sperry (p. 2,545), Mr. Underwood (p. 2,546), Mr. Foster (p. 2,547), Mr. Gaines (p. 2,547), Mr. Smith, of Kentucky, (p. 2,550), Mr. Sims (p. 2,550), and Mr. Smith, of Illinois (p. 2,551). The same bill was further considered on the 6th, the speakers being Mr. Boutell (p. 2,595), Mr. Williams, of Mississippi, (p. 2,599), Mr. Klutz (p. 2,599), Mr. Graf (p. 2,601), Mr. Candler (p. 2,603), Mr. Pearre (p. 2,603), Mr. Livingston (p. 2,603), Mr. Tirrell (p. 2,603), Mr. Latimer (p. 2,603), Mr. Irwin (p. 2,603), Mr. Williams, of Illinois, (p. 2,606), and Mr. Spight (2,606); and also on the 7th, when the following members spoke: Mr. Padgett (p. 2,647), Mr. Warnack (p. 2,648), Mr. Small (p. 2,650), Mr. Long (p. 2,651), Mr. Haugen (p. 2,651), Mr. Holliday (p. 2,651), Mr. Johnson (p. 2,652), Mr. Cromer (p. 2,652), Mr. Zenor (p. 2,654), Mr. Smith, of Kentucky, (p. 2,654), Mr. Cowherd (p. 2,657), Mr. Klitchin, North Carolina, (p. 2,657), and Mr. Shackelford (p. 2,657). Continuing the consideration of the same bill on the 8th, the House, in committee of the whole, listened to Mr. Griggs (p. 2,676), Mr. McRae (p. 2,680), Mr. Davidson (p. 2,681), Mr. Kern (p. 2,681), Mr. Talbert (p. 2,683), Mr. Lever (p. 2,684), Mr. Miers (p. 2,684), Mr. Conner (p. 2,688), and Mr. Tate (p. 2,688).

Record Notes.—Conference report on the Philippine tariff bill is printed on page 2,478; and that on pension appropriations at page 2,543.

A paper on presidential assassinations and anarchism, by Judge LeBaron B. Colt, of the United States circuit court, originally read before the New Hampshire Bar association, appears at page 2,581; and Senator Patterson's proposed amendments to the bill for the protection of the president are printed at page 2,582.

The text of the petition of the Manila chamber of commerce relative to the Philippine tariff bill is given at page 2,624.

At page 2,694 is noted the introduction in the House of a joint resolution (H. joint resolution No. 165) for the amendment of the constitution relative to direct taxation.

The following speeches on the respective subjects named appear at the pages indicated: Ship subsidy, by Senator Clay, p. 2,567; consular and diplomatic appropriations, by Representative Feely, p. 2,575; free rural delivery, by Representative Williams, of Illinois, p. 2,617; by Representative Candler, p. 2,621; by Representative Livingston, p. 2,667, and by Representative Foster, p. 2,668.

MISCELLANY

PATH-MAKERS.

For The Public.

Working in Hell Gaps, full of poisonous germs,
Under the street amid the sewers, surges a line of men—
A human wave beating against the canyon walls,
And beating, too, more vainly, 'gainst the walls of greed,
Monopoly's impregnable defenses!

The blood of labor oils the wheels that grind the laborer down,
And Labor's fingers knit the knots of stern Oppression's lash.
The streets are full of human tools and toys,
Shaped for the uses of wealth.

If the tool is hurt, replace it with a new one;
Each has its day, who cares where the old tools lie?
Who cares for the broken toy?

I see the laborer's noon-day hour of rest;
Humbly he sits on the street curb,

Garbed like a fool, his faded jeans patched
and torn,
Holes in his dusty shoes
That ill protect the sores worn in the weary
feet.

He eats with relish his midday meal,
It is only dry bread and cheese, but the pail
is bright and clean,
Kept so by his loving wife, who stints her-
self

For the worker's commanding need.

The common laborers are the serfs of every
land;

Famine claims them for her earliest vic-
tims,

War for her powder's food.

'Tis not God's will that labor thus should
suffer,

'Tis not God's will—but Greed's!

For God rewards all Labor with all Wealth,
And they who rob the worker, first rob
God—

Nay, rather rob themselves—God is not
mocked!

Who keeps the rich man's doorway clean,
He is not tainted by the rich man's filth.
Some day the dirty path-maker and the
clean path-maker

Face to face shall meet, and their account-
ing hold:

"Give me my wage!" "I cannot." Then
the Judge

Almighty shall condemn his faithless pay-
masters—

Already slaves of vice—to slavery of toil,
Until the debt is paid, yea, e'en to the ut-
termost blood-drop!

THEODORA.

FROM GOV. TAFT'S STORY, ACCORD- ING TO MR. DOOLEY.

"'Passin' to th' pollytical situation,
I will say it is good. Not perhaps as
good as ye'ers or mine, but good.
Ivry wanst in awhile, whin I think
iv it, an iliction is held. Unforchun-
ately it usually happens that those
ilicted have not yit surrindhered. In
th' Ph'lippeens th' office seeks th'
man, but as he is also pursooed be th'
sojery, it is not always aisy to catch
him an' fit it on him. Th' counthry
may be divided into two parts, pol-
lytically—where th' insurrection con-
tinues an' where it will soon be."

"An, there ye ar're, Hinnissy. I
hope this here lucid story will quite
th' waggin' tongues iv scandal an'
that people will let th' Ph'lippeens
stew in their own happiness."

"But sure they might do something
f'r thim," said Mr. Hennessy.

"They will," said Mr. Dooley.
"They'll give thim a measure iv free-
dom."

"But whin?"

"Whin they'll shtand still long
enough to be measured," said Mr.
Dooley.—F. P. Dunne.

THE TWO GREAT TENDENCIES.

Cleveland is the home of both Tom
L. Johnson and Mark Hanna, but
every member of the present Ohio
legislature from Cuyahoga county

(of which Cleveland is a part) is a
democrat and friend of Johnson.
Senator Hanna has not a single rep-
resentative from his home county in
the state legislature. No wonder
Johnson is looked to as a democratic
Moses. Much of Johnson's political
success is undoubtedly true to the
forceful and magnetic personality of
the man, but it is, nevertheless, a
lesson well worth heeding to timid,
conservative Democratic leaders, who
are afraid to antagonize the finan-
cially powerful element in the party,
and who are more concerned with
contributions to the campaign fund
than genuine democratic principles.
Johnson has shown that masses of
the people of all parties can be ral-
lied to the support of clear-cut, def-
inite, concrete propositions in their
own behalf, and that the future hope
of the party is in radicalism, not
conservatism.

There is no room in the politics of
this country for two parties advocat-
ing the same plutocratic policies un-
der different names. Hanna and
Johnson represent as no other two
men in the country, the plutocratic
and genuinely democratic tendencies.
Give us in 1904 a square fight be-
tween the two tendencies with them
as the standard bearers, and you will
see a fight which it will be worth ten
years of a genuine democrat's life to
enlist in, even if he loses—which he
won't.—Fairhope (Ala.) Courier.

THE NATURAL LAW OF MARRIAGE.

An extract from an address on "What
is Sacred About Marriage?" delivered be-
fore the Chicago Society for Ethical Cul-
ture, Jan. 26, by Wm. M. Salter.

Marriage is more than friendship,
more than love; it stands in vital re-
lation to race purposes. It is founded
in the family—a union of parents for
the protection and education of the
young.

Promiscuity prevents progress, for
the possibility of progress largely de-
pends on a long period of infancy and
youth. Polygamy, with its recognized
duties to the young, promotes prog-
ress better than promiscuity, but
monogamy goes and always has gone
with the most advanced civilizations.

Marriage is the initiation to family
duty. It is sacred, because the family
is of such transcendent importance to
the race. It becomes really more sac-
red when we see the benefit of it than
when we merely have a vague religious
horror about violating it.

It is a mistake to say that love is
enough and that when people an-
nounce their love that is all the mar-

riage they need. Love (in the sense in
which we use the word when we speak
of "falling in love" or "being in love")
is not a sufficient basis for marriage.
If people do not add to it a firm choice
of the will they may find the first
ecstatic emotion waning and the prop
for the new relation giving away. Love
in the sense of rapturous delight can-
not be commanded, but truth and loy-
alty and service and unselfish devotion
are largely subject to our will. They
may last forever (when the object is
not positively unworthy).

This is the real permanent basis of
marriage. And here lies the signifi-
cance of pledges and vows, which to
some are so repugnant. We cannot
pledge romantic love, but we can loy-
alty and service. It is the height of
our moral being to make such pledges
—there is no true marriage without
them.

THE FARMER CAUGHT THE RAB- BIT AND HE CAN HAVE THE BONES.

Once upon a time there was a
thrifty rural matron who owned a
most expert rabbit-catching cat.
Nothing but a true sportsman would
have continued that cat's line of busi-
ness on his scale of rewards. After
the frugal dame had cooked and eat-
en the prize, she would kindly re-
mark: "Pussy caught the rabbit,
and pussy—shall have the bones."

For a long series of years the
western farmer has patiently borne
iniquitous tariff burdens which had
the sole effect of fattening manufac-
turing millionaires at the east while
he had to scratch night and day to
fight the mortgage on his farm. He
has been mulcted in fabulous sums
for tariff robberies on his clothing,
hardware, timber, glass and agricul-
tural implements.

Not only this, but he has industri-
ously planted and reaped the mam-
moth harvests that went abroad, and
furnished such a colonial "balance of
trade" in our favor that the country
has persistently voted to retain the
tariff burdens in grateful acknowl-
edgment of this farmer-made "pros-
perity."

All these years he has made it pos-
sible for the east to grow rich on tar-
iffs, supported and continued by his
ill-paid toil. All these years he has
caught the rabbit and got the bones
for his reward. The moment he de-
mands a bit of the meat the dear
manufacturer responds with the cold-
blooded retort that "the western gra-
nary is quite big enough as it is. If

you want any more development go down into your pocket and pay for it."

Verily the ingratitude of republics is a mild thing compared with the ingratitude of tariff millionaires.—Columbus (O.) Evening Press.

GHOST DANCE VS. FRENCH BALL.

News article in Chicago Chronicle of March 11.

John Olin, William Dyer and John Young, whose Indian names translated into English mean respectively Afraid-of-Death, Late-to-Awake and Trembling Knees, passed through Chicago the other day on their way back from Washington to the Bad River Indian reservation.

They went to Washington in response to a summons from Secretary Root, who wished to talk to them about the ghost dances which usually take place in Montana and Dakota at this time of the year. Olin was educated at Carlisle and speaks English like a college professor, though his speech at times is slow. He saw both President Roosevelt and the secretary of war.

"I admit," said Olin as the trio stood at a bar near the Northwestern depot yesterday morning and swallowed three glasses of whisky with gusto, "that ghost dances do harm to my race in that they excite too much. I am perfectly willing to use my influence to stop them. We educated Indians realize that the only hope for our tribes is in education and civilization.

"But speaking of dancing and civilization, I went to a ball in Washington while I was there. It was the product of civilization and was called the French ball. I saw scenes there which would have disgusted my tribe. I am told that the women who danced were not received in Washington society. That may be, but the men who aided and abetted them were senators and congressmen and persons who held high government positions. If the Indians were thoroughly civilized I don't believe they would permit such antics as that to take place."

In coming through from Washington to Chicago the Indians were in the company of a reporter for the Chronicle. All seemed to have a good knowledge of American history and affairs. When Harper's Ferry was called out by the brakeman Young burst out:

"Harper's Ferry! John Brown! I wonder if the Indians will ever have

a John Brown. We need one almost as much as the slaves of the south did. We do not wish to be freed from bondage, but we wish to be freed from ignorance and crime."

AN OPEN LETTER TO SENATOR PLATT.

For The Public.

Illustrious Sir: The academicians seem to be playing havoc with our blessed balance of trade theory, and it looks as though their sacrilegious onslaught upon our favored institutions may make headway with the voters. It is evident that the time is at hand for one of our traditional coups d'etat. We have been so successful with our changes of front heretofore that we need not fear the one that we are now due to undertake. The G. O. P. must become the free trade party. We have, in turn, taken from the Democrats each of their pet theories, and made it our own. That is because we have the courage which they lack. They elected Cleveland on a free trade campaign. At least his election was a protest against our "protection" position. But they had not the valor to stand by their guns.

Proclaiming themselves for liberty, the Democracy of the country became the bulwark of human slavery. Our own party was launched amid demands for "Free land, free men, Fremont." We did not get Fremont or the other freedoms, but we got Lincoln four years later. We have managed to get away from Lincoln, just as we have departed from our enthusiasm for free land and free men. We started as a Republican party, and have by easy stages become an imperial party. We can hold our voters together easily if we make our changes carefully. We were the original greenback party, and at the proper time we retired the greenbacks. We were for silver, then bi-metallism, and are now for gold. There has been no jar in these various transitions, because our party has always had able leadership. I contend that our leadership to-day is in safe hands, and so I feel confident that I shall soon be able to give free expression to my free trade views and remain an ardent adherent of our party. It is for you to "strike the keynote."

My impression is that we can elect several presidents on a free trade avowal. We got in quite a number on the bloody shirt, some on protection to American industries, and at least one on a full dinner pail. Let us whirl in and reverse our "balance of trade" theory in such a way as to make it ap-

pear that we were always on the sophomoric side of the controversy.

Have no fear that the "flop" will be apparent. See how easy it was for us to condemn reconcentrado camps in Cuba, and approve them in Asia and South Africa. No difficulty attended our change from free silver to "sound money." From our protestations of "The land for the people," we found an easy course to give the public domain to the railroad owners.

There was a time when a free trader might be charged with being in the employ of the Cobden club, and bribed with British gold. But we have, since then, adopted so many of the British policies, including those of the Marquis of Bute and George III., that our people are now ready for anything we set before them bearing the British trade-mark.

With profound esteem,

HERMAN KUEHN.

THE FILIPINOS ARE CHRISTIANS.

For The Public.

From a recent speech in Boston by President Schurman, of Cornell university, it would seem that he is becoming somewhat disillusioned. When the McKinley administration adopted the British form of oppression in its treatment of the Christians of Luzon, President Schurman was led by the hypocritical, false pretenses of the administration to believe that the "sole object of taking the Philippines was the humanitarian aim of carrying to them the blessings of liberty." It is encouraging to believe that President Schurman is not the only supporter of the McKinley administration who was animated by the spirit of American liberty; and that they would not have sanctioned our brutal colonial servitude on the British plan had they not been deceived into believing that the administration was honest and true to American principles of liberty.

It is to be hoped that the more honest Roosevelt will make partial amends for the wrongs committed by his predecessor. The worst of it is, though, that full amends cannot be made. It is impossible to return the lives that have been taken, or to fully restore the confidence which the Filipinos had in us before they knew us as well as they do now. It is also to be hoped that others besides President Schurman will have their eyes opened; and that unless the United States government abandons the imperialism of the old world, which we have, been taught

to despise, and returns to the democratic principles of liberty, which we have been taught to revere, they will express their disapproval in the only way which the administration seems to respect, viz.: by means of the ballot.

Many have been confused by the pretense that national honor required the subjugation of the Christian Filipinos. How false and dishonorable is this claim, when we remember that the reason given for bribing with salaries, instead of subjugating the polygamous, slave-holding Mohammedans of Sulu, was, that they were a fierce and warlike people, who would savagely resist any interference with their institutions! How false and hypocritical is this plea of national honor, when we consider that instead of treating the Christians of Luzon as well as we did the savage Sulu Mohammedans, we adopted the suggestion of Mr. John Foreman, who advised our government: "The islands are a splendid group, well worth picking a quarrel and spending a few millions sterling to annex them." (See P. 556, Government Document, No. 62.)

What becomes of the national honor and the pretense of conferring the blessing of Christian civilization, when we pusillanimously hire the Sulu Mohammedans to float the stars and stripes over polygamy, slavery and despotism, while at the same time we kill Christians in Luzon by the thousands because they are guilty of only one crime—the same crime of which the American colonies were guilty in the days of George III?

Since we believe in killing Christians because they desire self-government, while we protect Mohammedans in the practice of polygamy, slavery and despotism, it is fair to ask whether we believe in the principles of Christian civilization, to say nothing of a desire or the ability to teach them to other peoples, who are already Christian.

A. B. CHOATE.
Minneapolis, Minn., Feb. 10, 1902.

SHALL WE ABANDON GREAT MORALS?

For The Public.

To denounce as "sentimental" or "academic" every protest against the present un-American foreign policy of the United States appears to be a favorite occupation of the administration politicians and of the subsidized administration press.

If the intent be to identify "sentiment" with "sentimentality," the effort is wide of the mark, for the one term is a gross perversion of the other. "Sentimental" may be predicated of that to which the reason has not contributed—the result merely of feeling. But a sentiment is an opinion derived from the cooperation of the intellectual and moral faculties.

The cultivation of just sentiments strengthens the character and enriches the individual life. It is sentiment that controls our relations with our fellow men in society. It is sentiment that originates law, and it is sentiment that induces obedience thereto on the part of every right-minded citizen. It is sentiment that effects every private contract, and it is sentiment that gives to every treaty its binding force. It is sentiment that dictates every just national policy. As an individual without sentiment is a poor creature indeed, so a nation whose policies evince its want, is a spectacle for men and gods.

It is perhaps natural that they who attempt the defense of policies permeated with that which Holy Writ declares to be the root of all evil should resort to an expression implying excessive sensibility. It might be expected that the apologists for highway robbery and murder on a national scale would object to considerations suggested by the Decalogue.

But to return to sentiment. What were Magna Charta and the English bill of rights? Sentiment. What was the declaration of Hampden: "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute?" Sentiment. What was the assertion of our revolutionary fathers: "Taxation without representation is unjust?" Sentiment. What was the declaration of independence? Sentiment. What is the "bill of rights" in our federal constitution? Sentiment. What has been the demand for civil and religious liberty in all history? Sentiment. It ill becomes men to sneer at sentiment, who are to-day enjoying that constitutional liberty which is the product of some of the best sentiments of the race.

And the protest against certain governmental policies, we are told, is "academic," too; that is, theoretical, and not practical. The discussions eventuating in the declaration of independence were indeed academic, but they were at the same time eminently practical.

Our revolutionary fathers were disposed to square every political consideration with the moral law—a law whose obligation they knew could be impaired by no enlargement of terri-

tory, no increase of population, no development of trade—a law which they knew to be more binding on a village community than on an imperial state.

The constitutional creation of the fathers was not builded for a generation, or for a century, but for the ages. It was builded to be, not a republic to-day and an empire to-morrow, but a republic forever. Neither war, nor trade, nor colonization, were to be the glories of the nation they builded, but education, and science, and art, and the perfection of self-government. They builded a nation whose freedom from foreign alliances should be regarded as not more important to the weakness of its youth than to the strength of its later years—a nation which should be recognized the world over, not as the exploiter of the bodies and souls of men, but as a moral menace to every invasion of man's rights—the political emancipator of the race.

"Academic" this may be, but observance thereof is as binding on the national conscience to-day as it was yesterday, and no more obligatory to-day than it will be to-morrow. "Academic" this may be, but, if anything is practical for the statesmanship of the year 1902, it is these very considerations. Disregard of them means nothing more or less than the beginning of the end of the republic of the United States.

It is believed that if the fathers could have foreseen the blighting commercialism of the present day, and the infinite shame it is bringing to the national escutcheon, they would have provided positive constitutional guarantees against present abuses. That they did not make such provision can only be ascribed to their inability to anticipate such political apostasy on the part of their descendants.

JOHN SAMPSON.

No. 2420 14th St., Washington D. C.
Jan. 20, 1902.

JOHN P. ALTGELD'S LAST SPEECH.

An abstract of the speech delivered at the pro-Boer meeting in Joliet, Ill., March 11, by Hon. John P. Altgeld; furnished to The Public from Joliet under date of March 11.

At a great pro-Boer meeting held at the opera house here to-night, ex-Gov. Altgeld declared that all friends of humanity owed a debt of gratitude to Gov. Yates for issuing a proclamation soliciting assistance for the Boer women and children who are perishing in foul concentration camps which the British are maintaining in South Africa.

He said that the kind people of

America had raised a large sum of money with which to relieve the distress of the Boer women and children, and now we are unable to send it to them. And he then made the startling declaration that we, the most powerful people of the world, could not even perform an errand of charity, because Lord Pauncefote, the British ambassador at Washington, objected to it; that while we were boasting of our power and of our prestige, and claiming to be a world power, we could not even send a chest of medicine, or a basket of bread, to perishing women and children, because the English ambassador was opposed to it.

Gov. Altgeld further charged that Lord Pauncefote has for several years meddled in American affairs, and that our state department and Secretary Hay were mere vest pocket conveniences for the British ambassador.

There were 18 counts and specific charges in Gov. Altgeld's indictment.

1. That just before the beginning of the Spanish war Lord Pauncefote, representing the aristocracy of the old world, meddled in our affairs, and tried to unite the governments of Europe in making a joint protest against America's interference in behalf of Cuba.

2. That when the American people asserted themselves, and our government was compelled to go to the rescue of Cuba, then England issued a strong neutrality proclamation, forbidding all of her subjects everywhere from furnishing us aid, or doing anything that would in any way be a violation of the strictest neutrality.

3. That the treaties between England and the South African republics recognized the latter as independent nations, except only as to the right to make treaties with foreign countries; that Chamberlain had repeatedly declared in and out of parliament that they were independent nations, and that England had no right to interfere in any manner with their internal affairs; that Gladstone and Morley and Brice and that great body of English people who have made England great, were in favor of doing justice to the Boers, but that the aristocracy, to which Lord Pauncefote belonged, the stock speculators, the gamblers, the whisky-drinking, cock-fighting, strutting, brutal element that was running the government, wanted the lands and

the gold fields of the Boers, and brought on this war.

4. That had our government at that time been true to our traditions and intimated to England that we should regard the destruction of the two young republics of South Africa as an unfriendly act toward all republican governments, England would have stopped, she would have arbitrated, and the horrors that have since been enacted in South Africa would not have happened.

5. But that instead of being true to the sentiment of our people and republican institutions, our state department was so manipulated by Lord Pauncefote, the British ambassador, that it gave England positive assurances of our moral support in everything she might do; that these assurances were given with so much ostentation as to attract the attention of the world.

6. That Chamberlain publicly boasted that while there was no written alliance between the two governments, there was what he called an understanding between statesmen which he said was of far more importance than written treaties.

7. That in consequence of the stand taken by our government other countries were deterred from interfering, and from helping the Boers.

8. That consequently, through Lord Pauncefote's manipulation, our government has rendered Great Britain greater service than it could have rendered by sending armies and navies into the war.

9. That we have thus made ourselves moral partners in guilt, and morally responsible for the murders, the burnings and the infamies practiced in South Africa by the English aristocracy.

10. That through Lord Pauncefote's manipulation Secretary Hay's son was sent as consul to South Africa, and was ostentatiously sent by way of Lord Salisbury's office to get his instructions; that this was done on purpose to show the other nations that our country would stand by England.

11. That then the inter-oceanic canal treaty was negotiated by Secretary Hay with England, by virtue of which we were to furnish all the money, and do all the work, and get the right of way, but were not to fortify it, but were to leave it in such a condition that the English navy could at any time render our property worthless; and that this pusillanimous treaty was defeated by a republican senate.

12. That the British censor in South

Africa has repeatedly stopped and opened our mails which the United States government sent to its own officers in South Africa; that in some cases the censor held these mails back for weeks, and then kindly wrote an indorsement on the envelope, permitting them to pass. Gov. Altgeld held up before his audience fac similes of the envelopes with the English censor's indorsement on them, showing how the mails of the American government were thus tampered with, and he charged that no other government on earth would submit to such an insult; but that through the influence of Lord Pauncefote our state department was prevented from even making a protest.

13. That in 1898 the American people declared that concentration camps could not be tolerated on American soil; that now for nearly two years England is maintaining concentration camps in the Bermuda islands, which are a part of America, where she is imprisoning not only men, but eight and ten year old boys, and that no protest has been made by our government against this practice.

14. That instead of maintaining strict neutrality between England and the Boers, as England compelled her subjects to maintain between us and the Spaniards, we have allowed the English to maintain a regular supply camp at New Orleans for the purpose of supplying the English with munitions of war, and have shipped over 150,000 head of horses and mules, beside other munitions of war, without which England could not possibly have continued the contest; that we have violated all the laws of neutrality, and that although many of our people have protested against this outrage, Lord Pauncefote's influence over the state department is so strong that not even a protest has been made against it.

15. That now after the humane people of America have raised funds with which to buy medicine and furnish other relief as a matter of charity to the women and children who are perishing in British concentration camps in South Africa, our Secretary of State Hay has refused to even apply for a passport for an American citizen to carry this charity fund to South Africa; that Lord Pauncefote's influence at the state department at Washington is more potent than that of 70,000,000 American people.

16. That through the influence of Lord Pauncefote, we are going to send a special embassy to the coronation of King Edward, so as to indorse the doctrine of the divine right of kings, and at least by our conduct apologize

for the acts of the fathers in establishing republican institutions in America founded on the rights of man.

17. Gov. Altgeld further declared that Gen. De Wet with his fighting farmers was a more important factor in the progress of the world than was King Edward VII.; that De Wet and his farmers represented the aspirations and the hopes of the toiling millions of the earth, in all lands, who do the world's work, and make civilization possible; while King Edward VII. represented simply the parasitic classes that eat the substance of other men's toil.

18. The governor further declared that England was on the downward grade, and will in time pass off of the maps of the world; and that if every Boer in South Africa were shot down, the glory of their heroism would live through the eternities and be forever an inspiration to mankind.

Domiey—Do you think the administration is pro English?

Trumley—No, but I am afraid I should be thinking it was pro English if it was running cheap excursions down to New Orleans, so that the common people could see the embarkation of the South African mules.

G. T. E.

"I had no idea that my gambling at Monte Carlo would create so much of a sensation," said the rich American.

"Well," said the friend, "there is a strong local sentiment in America. People couldn't understand why, if you were determined to gamble for high stakes, you should not leave the money in Wall street. — Washington Star.

Crokerly—Is Heeler a wire puller?

Plattster—He's more than that. He's a wireless puller.

G. T. E.

Dorothy—We have had a lovely autumn.

Margaret—Yes, I've enjoyed every minute of it. Indeed, I have been wickedly happy; but I'm going to begin next month and worry like everything.—Life.

The Pusher—Don't you believe all that Gov. Taft says?

The Doubter—I believe more.

G. T. E.

Upon the other hand, if there were no such thing as a cold in the head, perhaps every man you met would have a remedy for trusts, or something like that.—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

In "The American Farmer," by C. M. Simons (Chicago: Chas. H. Kerr & Co., 56 Fifth avenue. Price, 50 cents) an attempt is made to interest the agricultural class in the Socialist party. Besides containing an interesting compendium of the history and present condition of agricultural industry in the United States, Mr. Simons's monograph explains the philosophy and expected development of socialism from the point of view of the "scientific" cult of which Marx was the founder and the German leaders in socialist politics are later expositors. The philosophy and programme of this socialism is, in their estimation, to use the language of the monograph, "nothing more or less than a series of deductions from observed social facts." As soon as any new social facts appear, still following this text, socialism "must admit them into its premises, and if necessary modify its conclusions." It is difficult to forbear reflecting, at this point, that if that were practiced more assiduously by socialist thinkers with reference to all the large social facts that have already appeared and still exist, "scientific" socialism might be more truly scientific. Like the other literature of this cult, Mr. Simons's appeal to the American farmer is marred by loose generalizations and eccentric analyses, due to disregarding manifest and decisive facts in social experience; but the book presents an outline of "scientific" socialism so much more precise and lucid than is usual with the propaganda literature of the subject that it would be for that reason alone, if for no other, a book which all who are interested in social phenomena ought to read.

PERIODICALS.

—The Comrade, for March, makes a specialty of the Paris Commune of 1871.

—Both the leading article and the leading miscellaneous editorial of the Open Court for March are on the subject of taxation, the former by Judge A. N. Waterman, of Chicago, and the latter by the editor, Dr. Paul Carus. If the enterprising single tax letter writers who have recently enlivened the columns of the Chronicle do not make the mail of Judge Waterman and Dr. Carus lively, it will not be because these distinguished thinkers have offered no openings. It is almost inconceivable that men of their ability and acquirements should be capable of falling into elementary errors so manifest and gross.

—The Atlantic Monthly for March (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.), a magazine which is admirably doing for the serious thought and cultivated literary taste of the time what the heavy reviews and picture book monthlies hardly more than profess to do, surpasses its previous issues in the importance, variety and human interest of its contents. In light literature there is an installment of Cable's "Bylow Hill," and a complete story by Florence Williamson. Poetry is represented by "An Italian Rhapsody," from the pen of Robert Underwood Johnson, and an essay, by William Roscoe Thayer, on "Dante as a Lyric Poet. In history, Goldwin Smith writes of "England and the War of Secession," and Charles E. Bennett of municipal reform in the Rome of the first century, while Rowland E. Robinson describes, in the guise of dialect narrative, an old-time New England town meeting. An article on vivisection is contributed by Henry Childs Merwin. The Philippine question passes under review in two phases, the educational problem and the economic. Trusts "in the light" of the census is an important article which might better be described as "in the colored light" of the census. The most significant article of all, however, is by Edwin Burritt Smith, on municipal self-government, in which he argues against submitting the local affairs of cities to state control. The radical character of this article may be inferred from its conclusions that state control over local affairs violates the principle of self-government, "endangers the state in the vain effort to serve the city," "relieves the people of the city of local responsibility," and "corrupts and paralyzes both state and city administration."

The Public

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY,
1501 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:
THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

HARRIS F. WILLIAMS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
806 Chamber of Commerce Building,
CHICAGO.

WALTER A. LANTZ, T. G. MCELLIGOTT
Telephone Central 254.

LANTZ & MCELLIGOTT,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
1025-1030 Unity Building, 79 Dearborn St., Chicago.

CHARLES H. ROBERTS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,
614 Hoanoke Building, Chicago.

Cleveland.

SAMUEL DOERFLER,
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELOR,
501 American Trust Bldg. Cleveland, O.

Houston.

EWING & RING,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.
Fresley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1283 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012.
NEW YORK.

BUST PORTRAIT OF HENRY GEORGE

A fine photograph of the great economist copied from a crayon portrait by a prominent artist.

Unmounted, 8 x 10, \$.75, postpaid.
Mounted, 11 x 14, 1.00, postpaid.

EDWIN HAMMOND,
397 Bedford Av., Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE MULTITUDE MAGAZINE.

The exponent of Imperial Socialism. The domination of the world by the white race united and perfected by socialism. Walter Vrooman, editor. 50c a year. Send for sample copy to 123 E. 28th St., New York City.

For any Book on Earth
Old or New
Write to
H. H. TIMBY,
Book Hunter,
Connect, Ohio.
CATALOGUES FREE.